DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 993 CS 204 606

AUTHOR Schafer, John C.
TITLE Text Analysis: What Is It? Will It Help Composition Teachers?
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (29th, Denver, Colorado, March 30-April 1, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Composition (Literary); *Discourse Analysis; *English Instruction; *Linguistics; *Structural Analysis; *Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Composition Process

ABSTRACT

Text analysis is the study and description of units of verbal behavior larger than the sentence and is concerned with elements of sentences and with the internal relations of larger passages as well as with how a text relates to the communicative situation in which it occurs. It is of current interest because literary critics have moved toward linguistics and linguists have moved toward texts and the two groups have met on common ground. Also, interest in text analysis is related to the rise of knowledge about hermeneutics--the rules, methods, and theory governing exegesis. There are several approaches to text analysis including cotext, pretext, intention, and context, each of which is related to the types of knowledge one needs to read a text. Text analysis can help composition teachers because it affords the possibility of giving conscious control of the text to students by providing them with descriptions of texts that are more complete and more accurate than those presently available. It also can help heighten students' awareness of the differences between a spoken text and a written one. The greatest contribution of text analysis may be political--it may unite people from different disciplines around an interest in texts and what text-building is in different disciplines. (TJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED167993

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John C. Schafer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

John C. Schafer

Text Analysis: What is It? Will It Help Composition Teachers?[1]

Most of us who are interested in language but are not linguists know that linguistics is changing but that's about all we know. We know, for example, that Chomsky's transformational grammar theory is slipping in popularity, but we aren't sure what is replacing it. We hear talk of generative semantics, case grammar, stratificational grammar, tagmemic theory, and text or discourse analysis, but few of us understand these approaches. Those of us who are interested in the relation of linguistic theory to pedagogy wonder whether there is anything happening in linguistics these days that English teachers should know about. In this paper I will not attempt anything so grandiose as a general survey of all the new developments in linguistics; instead, I will concentrate on only one--the upsurge of interest in text analysis. I'll define text analysis, explain why it is being so much discussed these days, and survey some approaches. Finally, I will speculate as to its usefulness for one group of English teachers: those who teach composition.

Definitions

Text analysis is the study and description of units of verbal behavior larger than the sentence. Among students of language, text analysis serves to distinguish the work of linguists such as Charles Fries and Noam Chomsky, whose focus has been on sentences, from that of linguists such as Kenneth Pike[2] and Teun van Dijk,[3] who have gone beyond the sentence to examine the texts that comprise them. A sentence linguist is interested

CS204606

in such things as the order of elements in a noun phrase and the relations of a subject of a sentence to its predicate. A text analyst is interested in these grammatical features--and in more: in the internal relations of larger passages--in how the third sentence in a paragraph relates to the sixth, for example. Many text analysts are also interested in external relations--in how a text relates to the communicative situation in which it occurs.

With the emergence of any new area of inquiry comes a new taxonomy and a new set of labels. Text analysis is no exception. For those who examine the internal relations of texts, Widdowson has suggested the term text analyst; for those who study external relations (of text to communicative situation), he suggests the term discourse analyst.[4] His distinction has not caught on: text analysis and discourse analysis are more or less interchangeable terms for the study of texts; and used interchangeably, the terms fail to distinguish studies that stress internal relations from those that stress external ones. Nevertheless, as Sandelescu points out, different polarizations have grown up around the two terms despite their general interchangeability. The term text analysis frequently denotes a model-centered approach to the study of written language, whereas discourse analysis often implies a data-centered, experimental approach to the study of spoken language--to the study of how and when a child acquires the ability to construct a complete discourse, for example.[5]

I will shun both Widdowson's distinction and Sandelescu's polarizations and use text analysis as an umbrella term for the study of both the internal and the external relations of written and spoken texts.

Why Is Text Analysis Being Talked About?

I believe that much of the current interest in text analysis derives primarily from two recent developments in the United States, one in literary studies and one in linguistics. In brief, what has happened is this: impressed with the usefulness of linguistic approaches, literary critics have moved toward linguistics; meanwhile, frustrated with the problems of working with isolated sentences, linguists have moved up to texts. Both literary critics and linguists have moved from their previous assumptions and met on neutral ground; their coming together has contributed to increased interest in text analysis throughout the academic community.

New Critics such as Cleanth Brooks and William Wimsatt and their followers, who were so influential in the 1950's and 60's, were text analysts par excellence, of course: they believed above all in a close reading of poetic texts. But they were not very open to linguistic approaches. The structuralist and post-structuralist literary critics who seem to be replacing them, on the other hand, have been open to linguistic approaches from the beginning. Their methods, in fact, originated in those of contemporary linguistics.

Linguists have moved up to texts because the study of sentences in isolation has afforded either incomplete questions or inadequate answers. Their methodology itself, by confining them to sentences, precluded attention to the linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts that obviously inform the structure and the meaning of sentences. Chafe points out, for example, that sentence-bound grammar does not characterize adequately the two instances of the definite article the in the sentence She decided to sell the cow and buy a shop with the money. One's description of such a

sentence must take into account the speaker's knowledge of both its linguistic and socio-physical setting.[6] In attempting to describe the latter setting, linguists are moving beyond the text to consider aspects of texts that literary critics have traditionally elected not to investigate. Both New Critics and structural literary critics have attempted to explicate the internal relations of texts. For Cleanth Brooks the "context" that he said possessed the power to "qualify" the meaning of words and lines in poems was the co-text, the rest of the poem, not the socio-physical setting surrounding it.[7] He treated the poem as, in Ong's phrase, a "closed field."[8] For the structuralists, the goal was to do an "immanent" analysis of a literary work. Now some critics, Ohmann[9] and Pratt,[10] for example, who are interested in applying speech act theory to literary analysis, are moving beyond the text to consider the "literary speech situation." The fact that now some literary critics share an interest with linguists in the pragmatics of texts is another development contributing to the current popularity of text analysis.

There is another cause of the current interest in text analysis: the rise of hermeneutics. Hermeneutics--the rules, methods, and theory governing exegesis--has a rich history; it has been developed in the work of the Germans: Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer.[11] Prior to Schleiermacher, the term hermeneutics was used almost exclusively to refer to rules for biblical interpretation, but Schleiermacher and his followers expanded hermeneutics, turning it into a study of what is involved in the understanding of texts--all kinds of texts, not exclusively biblical ones. Americans, particularly professors of philosophy, have known this scholarship for some time, but its popularity among American

professors of literature and language is a recent phenomenon. Two men are primarily responsible for this increase in interest in hermeneutics: E. D. Hirsch and Paul Ricoeur. In two controversial books, Hirsch challenged the approach to text analysis favored by the New Critics and argued for a different approach that, he explained, was a "throwback" to the tradition of Schleiermacher.[12] The New Critics attacked Hirsch vehemently for succumbing to the "intentional fallacy," the identification of the meaning of a text with the original intention of the author.[13]

In 1976 the French scholar Paul Ricoeur visited the U.S. to deliver a series of lectures in which he argued that a proper criticism consists of a "dialectic" between the excessively de-psychologized approach of the New Critics and the excessively psychologized approach advocated by Hirsch.[14] I do not claim that as a result of Hirsch and Ricoeur's work hermeneutics has become a household word. But Hirsch and Ricoeur, by discussing hermeneutics, and by using this tradition to oppose the New Critics, have made it more generally known among American English professors. This discovery of German Hermeneutic scholarship has enabled present day text analysts to see themselves as the practioners of an ancient and honored discipline.

Some Approaches to Text Analysis

No new paradigm in text linguistics has won universal acceptance--or even the degree of acceptance that Chomsky's sentence-based transformational paradigm enjoyed during the 1960's. Instead, more and more linguists are venturing, under several banners, beyond the sentence and into territory which, though long occupied by literary critics and rhetoricians, to them is a new frontier. On the landscape of this frontier one already

discerns several text taxonomies: Roman Jakobson and James Kinneavy have chosen the dominant focus of texts for their principle of classification.[15] For Kinneavy, if the dominant focus is on the writer, the text is expressive; if it is on the hearer/listener, it is persuasive; if on the reality talked about, it is referential; if on the message itself, literary.

Productive as such classification by focus has been, I find an alternative, more provocative basis for classification in the work of Professor Alton Becker of the University of Michigan. Becker's chief interest is less in types of texts than in the types of knowledge one needs to read a text. Becker's classification is of these types of knowledge--knowledge, that is, as he believes, of four sets of relations. These sets or categories he labels as co-text, pre-text, intention, and context.[16] I will use Becker's classification of readers' knowledge as a basis for my own classification of several different approaches to text analysis itself. In explaining these four categories, I shall refer to Text A, which appeared in the "Life in These United States" section of the Reader's Digest, June, 1977.

TEXT A

1 A When my wife celebrated her birthday recently,
B there were the usual jokes from family members about the number of candles on the cake.

2 A But she was able to blow out every candle in the customary single breath.

3 A As she beamed triumphantly at her hecklers,
B a piercing sound brought the festivities to a halt.

4 A When we realized what had happened,
B the teasing started anew--

5 A the smoke from all the birthday candles had set off our newly-installed smoke alarm.

--I. Tom Badgett (Princeton, W. Va.)

Co-text

Becker's co-text relations are internal relations, those of one part of a text to another part. This category includes both intrasentential and intersentential relations. Analysis of the co-text relations of Text A, for example, would explain how the first sentence is put together as well as how it relates to the second sentence. In their book Cohesion in English, Halliday and Hasan describe six types of intersentence relation, five of which are represented in Text A.[17] The relation between the pronoun she in sentence 2 and its antecedent my wife in sentence 1 they call reference; the relation between sentence 2 and sentence 1 that is signalled by the word but they call conjunction; the relation between 5-A, which (for reasons I won't go into here) they call a sentence, and the noun clause what had happened in 4-A they call substitution; the relation between candles in sentence 1 and candle in sentence 2 they call lexical reiteration; and the relation between chains of words such as celebrated, birthday, and cake they call lexical collocation.

Becker's concept of co-text relation invites one to discern many other types of co-text relation. Labov and Waletsky have devised a way of analyzing the co-text relations of narrative texts by first determining what they call the primary sequence, by which they mean the order clauses from a story must be placed in if they are to recapitulate the order in which the story events are supposed to have occurred; they then show how story tellers alter this sequence to ensure that their stories satisfy the evaluative (or social interest) function, as well as the referential function, of narrative.[18] For example, in the primary sequence of Text A, the smoke sets off the alarm before the teasing starts up again;

but in the linear sequence of the final Reader's Digest version, the clause containing the information as to what set off the alarm occurs after the clause that informs the reader that the teasing resumed. The narrator provokes a question: What could have caused the piercing sound? And he delays the answer: we must first listen to him tell us the teasing started anew before we get it. The narrator distorts the primary sequence to put suspense in the middle of his story and punch in the ending--to make sure that, having read it, readers don't say "so what?"

Pre-texts

Pre-text relations are as important as co-text relations, for this reason: every text parallels or contradicts some prior text. To understand a text fully, one must know the pre-texts it evokes. Russian Formalists such as Shklovsky, who worked in the 1920's, understood this principle very well; and their essays are some of the best text analysis ever done.[19] Researchers in artificial intelligence have used the term "script" or "frame" for the type of pre-text that defines a well-known situation;[20] and linguists--most notably Van Dijk--have taken the idea of frame and made it a part of their analytical method. Frames, says Van Dijk, are "units of conventional knowledge according to which mutual expectations and interactions are organized."[21]

What scripts are activated by Text A? To understand Text A one must discern its stock deviation from the standard birthday script. It is a deviation insomuch as in the standard script a child, not a middle-aged woman, is the main character; it is a stock deviation insomuch as the birthday party for an older person has also become common; that is

to say, there's a script for such an occasion too.

The notion of pre-texts helps account for the English speaker's ability to make inferences to fill in the semantic spaces of a text. "Linear coherence," says Van Dijk, "depends on interpolated propositions that remain implicit in the expressed discourse and are inferred from the other propositions of the discourse with the help of lexical meaning postulates and frame information."[22] The writer of Text A doesn't have to specify the number of candles as large or say that this caused the jokes: we know because we know the script or frame. The notion of scripts also helps explain why the cake referred to in the first sentence is presented with a definite article even though it has not been mentioned before: it is old information for all readers who know the birthday script.

Intention

The New Critics argued that whether or not the avowed intention of an author was accessible to the analyst, it could be of no legitimate critical interest. It was they who conceived and coined "the intentional fallacy." But they never argued that authorial intention was irrelevant to the meaning of a text. Wimsatt and Beardsley's article on the intentional fallacy is not an argument for the irrelevance of authorial intention; it is rather a classification of the types of evidence that analysts might use in reconstructing it. For Wimsatt and Beardsley, public (internal to the poem) evidence was admissable; private (external to the poem) was not. They argued that critics should seek support for their assertions in the poem: that, said Beardsley, is "where the gold is."[23]

They should not seek testimony from the author or his friends. "Critical inquiries," they said, "unlike bets, are not settled in this way."[24]

Becker's approach is similar to that of the New Critics in that he would agree with Wimsatt and Beardsley that the author's intention should be recovered by analyzing the poem, not by interrogating or psychoanalyzing the poet. But unlike the New Critics, Becker and other linguists (Roman Jakobson, for example) consider literary texts to be, like ordinary language texts, dialogical: they satisfy a need to communicate. A poem, Becker would argue, like a conversation, is a discourse said by someone to somebody about something. The New Critics acknowledged that a poem may be a response to a need to communicate, but they urged the reader to see this need in a "dramatic" not a "pragmatic" light. "Both speaker and dramatic audience," says Wimsatt, "are assimilated into the implicit structure of the poem's meaning." Poems are acts, he continues, but to criticize them they must be "hypostatized" out of their communicative setting.[25] Ohmann identifies a weakness of the New Critical approach (a weakness that is avoided in Becker's approach) when he comments that "by Wimsatt's account, Yeats is not really, through 'Easter 1916,' taking sides in the rebellion, but putting forth an artistic hypothesis."[26] Becker then differs from the New Critics in emphasizing the dialogical quality of all texts--even written poetic ones.

Becker also differs from the New Critics in stressing that some information necessary for determining authorial intention lies outside the poem, in the form of presuppositions that readers bring to the text. Presumably Wimsatt and Beardsley would also admit these presuppositions as evidence (since they are public not private), but they rarely discuss them. The "extra-linguistic conventions" that Searle says enable a reader to

distinguish fictional from non-fictional texts are an example of the presuppositions Becker has in mind.[27] Searle argues that there are no intrinsic linguistic differences between fictional and non-fictional texts: what distinguishes them are a set of extra-linguistic conventions which, if evoked, signal to the reader that the writer is not making assertions, only pretending to. If these conventions aren't evoked, and the author doesn't tell the truth, then he is said to be lying, not writing fiction. How can Searle's observations be applied to Text A? We assume the writer of Text A intends to write a true story because there is no indication that the normal contract to tell the truth has been broken. What's more, the page soliciting items for the "Life in These United States" section says entries should be "true unpublished stories" from the writer's own experience. If this story appeared in the "Laughter is the Best Medicine" section of the Digest (which includes stories not very different in form or content from Text A), we would be more confused as to whether it was intended as fiction or non-fiction.

Becker also emphasizes that authorial intention is not only a matter of how one should take the propositional content of a text. All texts communicate on an interpersonal as well as a propositional level. Part of the meaning of Text A is communicated by the rather distant semi-stuffy voice in which it is written. The choice of certain words and organizations of words may be unconscious, Walker Gibson points out, but "every choice [a writer] makes is significant in dramatizing a personality or voice, with a particular center of concern and a particular relation to the person he is addressing."[28] By using rather formal diction (words such as festivities and started anew), by using a neuter agent as a

subject in the clause the teasing started anew, by using the passive construction newly-installed smoke alarm, and by refusing to make clear whether he joined in the teasing and general revelry, the narrator puts considerable social distance between himself and his reader. The way this story is told is part of its meaning; the medium is a part of the message.

Context

Until recently most American linguists have not been very interested in reference, or the relation of a text to its context. Fries explains that if they came across Rip Van Winkle's statement "I am a poor quiet man, a native of the place and a loyal subject of the king, God Bless Him," he and other American structural linguists would choose to analyze only its internal syntax, not how it related to the world of post-revolutionary America that Rip woke up to. But, of course, as Fries acknowledges, it is this very relation that gives Rip's statement much of its meaning and that explains why it almost caused a riot.[29] Rip Van Winkle is a work of fiction. Another question that could be asked concerns the relation between the post-revolutionary America as depicted in Washington Irving's story and the one we know from other sources. The relation of fictional worlds to what people perceive as the real world is another reference relation that has not been explored by either American structural or transformational grammarians.

European analysts have been more interested in reference. Mukarovsky distinguishes particular reference from global reference and maintains that the former is a prominent feature of informational texts and the latter of poetic ones.[30] The global reference of a work is its theme. Text A has particular reference because it refers to real people in

Princeton, West Virginia; a novel has global reference, or "reference as a whole," because it is the whole work rather than its particularities that relates to reality. According to Mukarovsky, the strengthening of one type of reference weakens the other. In Text A the strong particular references to actual people and events weaken (but do not destroy) Text A's capacity to enter into global reference, to have a theme. If pressed, one would probably say that it does have a theme--that it conveys the idea that "Pride goeth before a fall"; but one might read Text A without worrying about its theme--even though the editors of Reader's Digest say all entries to "Life in These United States" must be "revelatory of adult human nature."

Another European, Paul Ricoeur, distinguishes ostensive reference, as a property of spoken texts, from non-ostensive reference, as a property of written texts.[31] In much conversation, Ricoeur argues, reference is made to people and things physically present in the situation. Ricoeur's observation does not apply to the oral texts of people who have convened --at a seminar or convention, for example--for the express purpose of talking about something. But even texts performed on these occasions may have a high degree of ostensive reference. In a seminar, for example, reference may be made to a mimeo sheet that the seminar leader has circulated.

The reference of written texts, however, is non-ostensive: the arrows of reference point inward to the text, not outward to people or objects in the situation. Pronouns like this and that in written texts refer not to things in the environment but to other words in the text. Written texts must create their own context.

By non-ostensive reference, however, Ricoeur means something more than this quality of pointing inward. As text analyst, he refuses to deal only with co-text relations, to become trapped within the enclosure of the text, a fate he says structuralists such as Levi-Strauss are always in danger of succumbing to. By non-ostensive reference Ricoeur means not just what the author says but also what he inadvertantly conveys, what his text communicates that he (the author) can not be aware of because he cannot see beyond the horizon of his own existential situation.[32] By non-ostensive reference Ricoeur means the power of a text to disclose a world. Text A, for example, could be said to disclose a world in which people are afraid to confront the reality of old age and death and so take refuge in rituals such as birthday cake candle-blowing; a world in which people rely on machines for protection, expecting all sorts of miracles of them, such as the distinguishing of ceremonial birthday candle smoke from the smoke which accompanies a truly dangerous fire.

Will Text Analysis Help Composition Teachers?

Most of the experiments I am aware of have shown rather conclusively that teaching students a sentence-based grammar, with no sentence combining, doesn't change the way they write.[33] Because sentence grammars have helped student writers so little, one tends to be pessimistic about the likelihood that text grammar will be more useful to them. Have, however, grammar-based approaches failed because they were grammar-based or because they were based on the wrong type of grammar? I think the latter may be true. Research must determine whether students who can describe in more rigorous and systematic fashion the properties of texts are also students who can write better texts.

Some composition researchers believe that rigorous and systematic analysis is harmful--particularly if students are made to do it early in the composing process. "Writers must remain, to some degree, not only ignorant of what they are going to do but what they are doing," Murray says.[34] The position one adopts regarding the efficacy of teaching text grammar to composition students will depend finally, I believe, on how much conscious control over the construction of his texts one thinks a writer needs to have. Those who believe good writers are good because they have good intuitions will be very pessimistic about the prospects of teaching any kind of grammar. Those who believe that good writers are good because, in addition to having good intuitions, they have also achieved a high degree of conscious control of their language will be more optimistic about text analysis in a composition program.

But, it is important to ask: What properties of texts would students who learned text analysis be made more conscious of? This would depend on what approach to text analysis they were exposed to. As I have attempted to show above, different text analysts emphasize different sets of relations. In their book Cohesion in English, for example, Halliday and Hasan concentrate exclusively on a particular type of co-text relation. In his well-known work on the paragraph, Francis Christensen, too, concentrates on co-text relations.[35] Some composition teachers have found Halliday and Hasan's work interesting; many more have used materials from Christensen's Rhetoric Program. But a composition course in which only these approaches to texts were presented would not, I think, significantly improve students' ability to write. In fact, such a course might be harmful. An overemphasis on approaches stressing co-text relations might

reinforce in both teacher and student the assumption that the text is autonomous, that the only text relations that need by considered in writing are internal ones.

But a composition course that dealt only with intention relations would, I think, fail just as surely as one that concentrated exclusively on co-text relations. Many composition teachers have found Walker Gibson's work on style and speaker-audience relations informative and useful, but Professor Gibson, I'm sure, would be the first to point out that a writing course should include discussion of other relations besides those he has chosen to analyze. If text analysis is to be applied in the classroom, approaches which include treatment of more than one set of text relations stand a better chance of success than approaches which deal with only one. Composition teachers may find rigorous and systematic analysis distasteful because the analysis with which they are familiar is narrowly sentence-based; or, if text-based, it is devoted exclusively to internal co-text relations. They may find more broadly based approaches less distasteful and more useful. Kinneavy shares my belief that composition teachers and theorists should not remain trapped within the sentence--or within the text. Neither the sentence, nor the text, he says, is the "critical level." The key level, he continues is "situational context," a concept which is very similar to Becker's notion that there are four key sets of relations:

> Only in the dialect with the situational context do the word, then the sentence, the section, and even the text encounter the real tentativeness, changing relationships, relativity, and reciprocal interdependence which are determinative.[36]

Text analysts then may be able to help composition teachers by providing them with descriptions of texts that are more complete and

more accurate than those presently available. Some teachers, of course, are already operating effectively without such descriptions. Some already discuss all of the relations that Becker categorizes. In a sense, composition teachers have been doing and teaching text analysis for years. As linguists move up to the text from the sentence, and move out of the enclosure of the text to consider the relations a writer establishes to the content of his text and with his audience, linguistics becomes more rhetorical. Rhetoricians have traditionally devoted most of their attention to writer-audience relations; but most have emphasized that audience is only one part of the total "universe of discourse" that a speaker or writer who aims to be effective must bear in mind when he makes linguistic choices. In other words, the new text analysis, as I have described it here, is in many ways not very different from the old rhetoric. But the old rhetoric had a strongly prescriptive tone. What text linguists may be able to offer teachers of composition that rhetoricians haven't yet been able to deliver are better descriptions of (not prescriptions for) successful texts and of what successful teachers are doing right and unsuccessful ones doing wrong. After their study of writing instruction in British secondary schools, Britton et al. suggest students did not develop into mature writers because for the most part their teachers made them practice how to write only one type of text (transactional) for only one type of audience (teacher-as-examiner).[37] In conducting their study Britton and his colleagues drew heavily on recent work in text analysis. Their study is an example of the good work that can be done when those interested in composition cooperate with text analysts.

An interesting question occasioned by some text analysis is whether

students' heightened awareness of the differences between spoken and written texts would improve the quality of their writing. Ricoeur very clearly describes four ways in which spoken texts differ from written ones.[38] Would teaching students these four differences help them write better? For example, would teaching them to see that reference in written texts is not to something in the <u>situation</u> but to other words in the <u>text</u> make them more careful to clarify what antecedent they have in mind when they use the pronoun <u>this</u> to refer back to something in the preceding co-text? Bernstein has found that the conversation of children is characterized by ostensive reference to the environment of the speakers.[39] Children talk about things around them. Does lack of coherence in student essays reflect their transfer of spoken text habits to their written texts, much as first-language habits interfere with one's acquisition of a second language? I think that a teacher's carefully prepared contrastive analysis of spoken and written texts, such as that done by Ricoeur, may benefit students if presented in a form they can understand.

But text analysis' greatest contribution may be not pedagogical but political. It may unite people from different disciplines around an interest in texts--all kinds of texts, from a poem by Andrew Marvel to an essay written by a freshman in English 101. People have always been fond of remarking how different such texts are; now they may be more willing to explore the properties shared by all texts in the Anglo-American tradition--and to account for systematic differences. More and more people--linguists, literary critics, rhetoricians, and composition theorists--are now engaged in a single activity: the analysis of texts. It may be time to see what could be done if we recognized more fully that we are all

investigating the same thing--even if we are administratively compartmentalized, or departmentalized, in linguistics, English, and Speech.

Text analysis may also help unite scholars in the above disciplines, for whom language is an object of study, with scholars in such disciplines as sociology and physics, for whom language is primarily a tool. Many university administrators, who have concluded that one freshman composition course is not enough, are pushing for the establishing of an upper class writing program or requirement. Besides passing the freshman writing course, many students will soon have to demonstrate to their major department that they can write. The rationale for involving departments other than English in writing instruction often includes the argument that writing varies from discipline to discipline. Because the powers-that-be in each discipline prefer a particular style, method of organization, and persuasive design, a student who has been taught how to write, say, an English critical paper may not be able to write a good essay in sociology. Text analysts should be able to help those in charge of special writing programs to discover what, if anything, is special about the writing done in a particular discipline. The unfriendly shouting match in which English teachers accuse sociologists of writing jargon and sociologists accuse English teachers of not preparing students for the kind of writing required in their discipline may perhaps be replaced by a more useful and exciting activity: the exploration of the stated and unstated assumptions that govern text-building in different disciplines.

NOTES

[1]I would like to acknowledge my indebtedness to two University of Michigan Professors: Alton L. Becker of the Department of Linguistics and Bernard Van't Hul of the Department of English. Professor Becker introduced me to the approach to texts that provides the framework of this paper. Here I take the liberty of using Becker's categories to organize the work of different text analysts, but his approach is interesting in its own right. See "Text-building, Epistemology, and Aesthetics in Javanese Shadow Theater," in The Imagination of Reality, ed. Alton L. Becker and Aram Yengoyan, forthcoming. Professor Van't Hul read my paper and made many constructive suggestions.

[2]Kenneth L. Pike, and Evelyn G. Pike, Grammatical Analysis (Huntington Beach, Ca.: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1955).

[3]Teun A. van Dijk, Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse (London: Longman, 1977).

[4]H. G. Widdowson, "Discourse Analysis, Interpretive Procedures, and Communicative Language Teaching," Bulletin CILA [Commission Interuniversitaire Suisse De Linguistique Appliquee], 23 (1976), 57-63.

[5]Constantin-George Sandulescu, "Theory and Practice in Analyzing Discourse," in Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Applied Linguistics, vol. 1, ed. Gerhard Nickel (Stuttgart: HochschulVerlag, 1976), pp. 349-65.

[6]Wallace L. Chafe, "Discourse Structure and Human Knowledge," in Language, Comprehension and the Acquisition of Knowledge, ed. John B. Carroll and Roy O. Freedle (Washington, D.C.: V. H. Winston and Sons, 1972), p. 61.

[7]Cleanth Brooks, "Irony as a Principle of Structure," in Literary Opinion in America, ed. Morton D. Zabel (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 731.

[8]Walter J. Ong, S.J., "From Rhetorical Culture to New Criticism: The Poem as Closed Field," in The Possibilities of Order: Cleanth Brooks and His Work, ed. Lewis P. Simpson (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1976), pp. 150-67.

[9]Richard Ohmann, "Speech Acts and the Definition of Literature," Philosophy and Rhetoric, 4 (1971), 1-19.

[10]Mary Louise Pratt, Toward a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1977).

[11]Richard E. Palmer discusses this history in Hermeneutics: Interpretation Theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1969).

[12]Hirsch's two books are Validity in Interpretation (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967; and The Aims of Interpretation (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976). Hirsch explains the relation of his approach to Schleiermacher's in Aims, p. 17.

[13]See, for example, a collection of articles in Genre, 1 (1968), especially the one by Monroe C. Beardsley, "Textual Meaning and Authorial Meaning," pp. 169-81.

[14]These lectures are collected in Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning (Fort Worth, Tx.: Texas Christian University Press, 1976).

[15]Roman Jakobson, "Linguistics and Poetics," in Style in Language, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok (Cambridge, Ma.: M.I.T. Press, 1960), pp. 350-77; James L. Kinneavy, A Theory of Discourse (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971).

[16]Becker, "Text-building, Epistemology, and Aesthetics."

[17]M.A.K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, Cohesion in English (Hong Kong: Longmans, 1976).

[18]William Labov and Joshua Waletzky, "Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experiences," in Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts, ed. June Helm (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1967), pp. 12-44.

[19]Viktor Shklovsky, "On the Connection Between Devices of Syuzhet Construction and General Stylistic Devices," in Russian Formalism, ed. Stephen Bann and John E. Bowlt (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), pp. 48-84.

[20]Roger C. Schank, "SAM--A Story Understander," Yale A.I. Project Research Report 43, (1975), 1-40.

[21]Teun A. van Dijk, "Frames, Macro-Structures and Discourse Comprehension," in Cognitive Process in Comprehension: Proceedings of the XIIth Carnegie-Mellon Symposium on Cognition, ed. Patricia A. Carpenter and Marcel A. Just (Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum), p. 21.

[22]Ibid., p. 18.

[23]Beardsley, p. 181.

[24]William K. Wimsatt and Monroe C. Beardsley, "The Intentional Fallacy," in The Verbal Icon by William K. Wimsatt (Lexington, Ky.: 1954), p. 18.

[25]Wimsatt, Verbal Icon, pp. xv-xvii.

[26]Richard Ohmann, English in America: A Radical View of the Profession (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 73.

[27]John Searle, "The Logical Status of Fictional Discourse," New Literary History 6, (1975), 319-332.

[28]Walker Gibson, Tough, Sweet, and Stuffy (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1966), p. x.

[29]Charles C. Fries, "Meaning and Linguistic Analysis," Language 30, (1954), p. 66.

[30]Jan Mukarovsky, "Poetic Reference," in Semiotics of Art, ed. and trans. Ladislav Matejka and Irwin R. Titunik (Cambridge, Ma.: M.I.T. Press, 1976), pp. 155-63.

[31]Paul Ricoeur, "The Model of the Text: Meaningful Action Considered as a Text," Social Research 38, (1971), 529-62.

[32]Ibid., p. 558.

[33]See, for example, a study conducted by W. B. Elley, et al., "The Role of Grammar in a Secondary School English Curriculum," Research in the Teaching of English 10, (1976), 5-21.

[34]Donald M. Murray, "Internal Revision: A Process of Discovery," in Research on Composing, ed. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell (Urbana, Ill.: 1978) p. 90

[35]Francis Christensen, "A Generative Rhetoric of the Paragraph," College Composition and Communication 16, (1965), 144-56.

[36]James L. Kinneavy, "The Relation of the Whole to the Part in Interpretation Theory and in the Composing Process," Mimeo handed out by Professor Kinneavy at his presentation at College Composition and Communication Convention, Denver, Col., March 31, 1978.

[37]James Britton, et. al., The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18) (London: Macmillan, 1975).

[38]Ricoeur, pp. 529-545.

[39]Bernstein, B.B., "Social Class, Language and Socialization," in Language and Social Context, ed. Pier Paolo Giglioli (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1972), pp. 157-78.